REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were pending in the application. Claim 14 has been canceled. Claims 1-13 have been amended. Claims 15-21 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 15-21 are now pending in this application.

Section 103 Rejections

All independent claims stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Autor, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065751), in view of Richards, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0097422). Applicant disagrees with these rejections as set forth below.

Claim 1 refers to a "naming command specif[ying] a format for generating a plurality of unique character sequences." Claim 1 subsequently recites "in response to receiving the naming command, automatically creat[ing] a plurality of names, each of which has a character sequence that is arranged according to the format specified in the naming command." As but one non-limiting example included in Applicant's Specification, the name "SanDiego-Rack34-Shelf2-Blade4" has a character sequence that is arranged according to the format <building location: rack location: rack shelf: shelf component>. *See* Specification 26:29-34.[1]

Applicant therefore submits that Autor does not teach a "naming command specif[ying] a format for generating a plurality of unique character sequences" as recited in claim 1. Instead, Autor is directed to "a method for propagating a rack name within a computer server rack," so that "[i]f a server goes down or otherwise needs attention, a system administrator may remotely query the server for its location thereby allowing the administrator to find the server." Autor (Abstract) and ¶ [0006]. To this end, Autor discloses "[a] server administrator may use [an] external port to enter a rack name" for a rack in a particular server. *See id.* at ¶ [0033]. Autor's rack names, however, do not constitute "a format for generating a plurality of unique character sequences" as recited in claim 1. As discussed, the fact that a name sent by Autor's administrator is stored in some underlying data format (e.g., "a binary representation of an ASCII word or phrase," *see id.* at ¶ [0031]), in no way teaches or suggests the "format" of claim 1, which is used for generating "a plurality of names, each of which has a character sequence that is arranged according to the format specified in the naming command."

---

[1] Applicant is in no way intending to limit its claims to this particular embodiment; rather, this example serves to distinguish the use of the claimed "format," which is used "for generating a plurality of character sequences" that

Richards does not account for the deficiencies of Autor, as Richards is not at all concerned with "assign[ing] each of [a] plurality of names to a corresponding computer resource." Rather, Richards is directed to "the automatic distribution, installation, and monitoring of operating systems and application software on computers linked to a network from a remote location." Richards ¶ [0001]. Therefore, Richards cannot be said to teach a "naming command specif[ying] a format for generating a plurality of unique character sequences" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, even assuming that Autor and Richards are combinable, Applicant submits that the proposed combination would not teach each and every feature of claim 1.[2]

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. Independent claims 8, 9, and 13 (and their respective dependent claims) are believed to also distinguish over the cited references for at least reasons similar to those provided for claim 1.

---

correspond to a name, from an underlying format (e.g., ASCII) in which data may be stored.

[2] The Examiner asserts in the Response to Arguments portion of the Office Action that Applicant "argu[es] against the references individually" and "one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references." See Office Action 9. Applicant notes that if none of the references teach a particular limitation of a claim, their proposed combination cannot be said to teach that particular limitation regardless of whether it is obvious to combine the references or not. For example, if a claim comprises limitations A, B, and C, a first reference teaches limitation A, and a second reference teaches limitation B, their proposed combination may teach A and B but cannot be said teach A, B, and C, since neither reference teaches limitation C. Accordingly, Applicant submits that both of the references fail to teach several of the limitations of claim 1 and thus their combination does not teach each and every feature of claim 1.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-85500/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 13, 2009   By: /Dean M. Munyon/
                                               Dean M. Munyon
                                               Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847